arXiv:1408.0635v1 [hep-ph] 4 Aug 2014

A note on gauge-fixing in the electroweak sector of UED with BLKTs

Anindya Datta *, Avirup Shaw †

Department of Physics, University of Calcutta, 92 Acharya Prafulla Chandra Road, Kolkata 700009, India

Abstract

In Universal Extra-Dimensional Models with one compact space like extra dimension, a Z_2 symmetry is imposed upon the action to have the chiral fermions present in the Standard Model. Orbifolding results into two fixed points along this extra space like direction. One is allowed to add operators which respect the symmetry of the theory at these fixed points. The coefficients of these operators are in general free parameters. In this note we will discuss the procedure of gauge-fixing when only kinetic terms involving fields are added to the boundary fixed points. We further discuss, the composition and masses of Goldstone and any physical scalar that emerges after the symmetry breaking in this set up with different choices of gauge.

PACS Nos: 11.10.Kk, 14.80.Rt, 13.85.-t
Key Words: Universal Extra Dimension, Boundary Localised Terms, Gauge-fixing

Extra dimensional models in which all the Standard Model (SM) fields propagate in one or more compactified space like extra dimensions offer viable solutions to several long standing problems of Particle Physics like Dark Matter [1], Unification [2] etc. We are interested in a particular incarnation of such models namely the Universal Extra Dimension (UED) where all the SM fields can feel a single compactified space like extra dimension (we call it y) [3]. The effective 4-dimensional action of UED, consists of SM particles and towers of their Kaluza-Klein (KK)-excitations. Members of a tower is specified by so called KK-number (n), which is nothing but the discretised momentum in direction of the extra dimension. Masses of the KK-excitations in n^{th} KK-state is typically nR^{-1}, where R is the radius of compactification. The interactions among the fields are governed by the $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Q$ gauge symmetry of the SM. To accommodate the chiral fermions of the SM, one has to demand for some extra Z_2 symmetry of the action after orbifolding the extra direction. This results into two special points $y = 0$ and $y = \pi R$ called the *fixed points*, along the y direction.

Radiative corrections to the masses of the KK-states are important from phenomenological view point and has been considered in Ref. [4] and in Ref. [5]. UED being an effective theory, lacks the ultraviolet completion in radiative corrections. So assumptions have been made in Ref. [5], so

*email: adphys@caluniv.ac.in
†email: avirup.cu@gmail.com

that at the cut-off scale, radiative corrections to all KK-masses identically vanish. In principle, one can take into account the contributions (to the radiative corrections) beyond the cut-off, by adding boundary localised-kinetic terms (BLKTs) at the fixed points with their coefficients as free parameters. These models are collectively called non-minimal UED (nmUED). The resulting phenomenology of nmUED has been investigated to some extent in existing literature [6, 7, 8, 9].

In this note, we would like to pay our attention to a particular aspect of a model of nmUED, namely the issue of gauge-fixing and the masses and composition of Goldstone and other physical scalars emerging after the electroweak symmetry breaking.

We start with the free action for a 5-D gauge field $A_M\ (x^\mu, y)\ \{\ M = 0, \ldots, 4;\ x^4 \equiv y\}$ [7, 8, 9] and Higgs field H [9] with BLKTs:

$$S_g = -\frac{1}{4}\int d^5x \left[F_{MN}F^{MN} + r_G\left\{\delta(y) + \delta(y-\pi R)\right\}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}\right], \tag{1}$$

$$S_H = \int d^5x \left[(D_M H)^\dagger (D^M H) + r_H\left\{\delta(y) + \delta(y-\pi R)\right\}(D_\mu H)^\dagger (D^\mu H)\right], \tag{2}$$

with $D_M = \partial_M + i\frac{g}{2}A_M$ and $H = \frac{(v+h+i\chi)}{\sqrt{2}}$, v being the VEV. r_G, r_H are the strengths of the boundary terms for gauge and Higgs field respectively.

For purpose of illustration we stick to the spontaneously broken $U(1)$ case (with the Higgs field acquiring VEV), however generalisation to $SU(2) \times U(1)$ will be a straight-forward job.

Eq.1 and 2 must be supplemented by the gauge-fixing action. One of the aims for fixing the gauge is to get rid of the terms in which A_μ couples to A_4 (arise in Eq. 1) and/or to χ (in Eq. 2). To ensure this (second) cancellation Higgs BLKT parameter r_H should be included in the gauge-fixing action given by,

$$S_{GF} = -\frac{1}{2\xi_y}\int d^5x \left[\partial_\mu A^\mu + \xi_y\{\partial_y A^4 - (1 + r_H\{\delta(y) + \delta(y-\pi R)\})m_A\chi\}\right]^2, \tag{3}$$

with $m_A = \frac{1}{2}gv\sqrt{\frac{1+\frac{r_G}{\pi R}}{1+\frac{r_H}{\pi R}}}$. The gauge-fixing action in case of 5-D QED in presence of BLKTs, has been discussed in [10]. We extend the prescription in Ref. [10] to the case when the symmetry is spontaneously broken.

y-dependent gauge-fixing parameter ξ_y, in Eq. 3, is defined through,

$$\xi = \xi_y\left(1 + r_H\{\delta(y) + \delta(y-\pi R)\}\right), \tag{4}$$

here ξ is independent of y. This relation can be seen as *renormalisation* of the gauge-fixing parameter as the BLKTs are in some sense counter terms taking into account the unknown ultraviolet contribution in loop calculations. In this sense, ξ_y is the bare gauge-fixing parameter

while ξ can be viewed as the renormalised gauge-fixing parameter taking the values 0 (Landau gauge), 1 (Feynman gauge) or ∞ (Unitary gauge).

KK-expansion of the different fields:

$$A_\mu(x^\mu, y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_\mu^n(x^\mu) a^n(y), \tag{5}$$

$$A_4(x^\mu, y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_4^n(x^\mu) b^n(y), \tag{6}$$

$$\chi(x^\mu, y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \chi^n(x^\mu) f^n(y), \tag{7}$$

$a^n(y)$ satisfy a differential equation of the form [9]:

$$\left[\partial_y^2 + m_{G^n}^2 + \{\delta(y) + \delta(y - \pi R)\}\{r_G m_{G^n}^2 - (r_H - r_G) m_A^2\}\right] a^n(y) = 0, \tag{8}$$

while, $f^n(y)$ and $b^n(y)$ satisfy a differential equation of the form [7, 8]:

$$\left[\partial_y^2 + m_{H^n}^2 (1 + r_H\{\delta(y) + \delta(y - \pi R)\})\right] F^n(y) = 0, \tag{9}$$

where $F^n(y) \equiv f^n(y)$ or $b^n(y)$.

We present the equation of motion for $a^n(y)$ for the sake of completeness. One can see that in case of $r_G = r_H$, Eq. 8 has the same form of Eq. 9 and they have the same solutions. In the following without loss of any generality of the discussion we will assume this equality. However, the Eq. 8 or its solution will not play any major role in the following.

We must keep in mind that the zero mode fields must correspond to respective SM particles. So some of the fields in 5-D theory should not have any zero mode counterpart. Consequently application of appropriate boundary conditions while solving the differential equation (Eq. 9) is very crucial. As for example, $A_\mu(x^\mu, y)$ and $\chi(x^\mu, y)$ should have zero modes corresponding to W/Z bosons and Goldstones. While $A_4(x^\mu, y)$ cannot have a zero mode.

Using the proper boundary conditions, solutions for $f^n(y)$ can be written in a compact form as $N_{2n} \cos m_{H^{2n}}(y - \frac{\pi R}{2})$ and $N_{2n+1} \sin m_{H^{2n+1}}(y - \frac{\pi R}{2})$ for even (including the zero mode) and odd modes respectively. N's are the normalisation constants. Note that this functions have a parity of $(-1)^n$ under $y \leftrightarrow y - \pi R$ transformation [1].

The eigenvalues m_{H^n}'s are the solutions of the transcendental equation [7]:

[1] This is equivalent to a reflection symmetry along a line $y = \frac{\pi R}{2}$ in the $y-$space

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{r_H m_{H^n}}{2} &= -tan\left(\frac{m_{H^n}\pi R}{2}\right) \text{ for even modes,} \\ &= cot\left(\frac{m_{H^n}\pi R}{2}\right) \text{ for odd modes.} \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Keeping in mind that 0-mode of A_4 is not desirable, one can easily write the solutions for $b^n(y)$, the y-dependent part of $A_4(x^\mu, y)$, They should vary as $\sin m_{H^{2n}}(y-\frac{\pi R}{2})$ and $\cos m_{H^{2n+1}}(y-\frac{\pi R}{2})$ for even and odd modes respectively. Unlike the f^ns, under $y \leftrightarrow y - \pi R$ transformation, b^{2n}'s are odd while b^{2n+1}'s are even respectively. Where, the eigenvalues m_{H^n}'s are the solutions of the transcendental equation (Eq. 10).

A careful look at the y-dependent wave functions of $b^n(y)$ and $f^n(y)$ would reveal that $\partial_y f^n(y) = m_{H^n} b^n(y)$. In fact, f^n's are so called *primitive* of b^n's [10]. In general a function $\tilde{b}^n(y)$ would be called the primitive of $b^n(y)$, if $\partial_y \tilde{b}^n(y) = m_{H^n} b^n(y)$. In principle, $a^n(y)$ could also be a primitive of $b^n(y)$ when r_H would equal to r_G.

Now let us come to the main point of our interest. What are the composition and masses of the any physical scalar mode that emerges after the symmetry breaking? To find this out one has to look into the mass-mixing matrix constructed out of the A_4^n and χ^n. Before we explicitly write down the matrix, some important points are to be noted. The diagonal terms are straightforward to obtain from Eq. 1, 2 and Eq. 3. The off diagonal elements of mass-mixing matrix are generated from the term of the form : $\int d^5x\, [m_A(\partial_y \chi) A^y]$ which originates from Eq. 2 and Eq. 3. Using the modal expansions (as in Eq. 6 and 7) one can express this as $\int d^5x \left[m_A \sum_{m,n} \chi^n(x^\mu) A^{4m}(x^\mu)(\partial_y f^n(y)) b^m(y)\right]$. Replacing b^m by $\frac{1}{m_{H^m}}\partial_y f^m$, (as $f^n(y)$ is primitive of $b^n(y)$) and performing the y-integral this can be further simplified to $\int d^4x \left[\sum_{m,n} \frac{m_A \chi^n(x^\mu) A^{4m}(x^\mu)}{m_{H^m}} \times I\right]$. Where I is the following overlap integral :

$$\begin{aligned} I = \int_0^{\pi R} (\partial_y f^n(y))(\partial_y f^m(y)) dy &= m_{H^m}^2 \int_0^{\pi R} f^n(y)(1 + r_H\{\delta(y) + \delta(y - \pi R)\}) f^m(y) dy \\ &= m_{H^m}^2 \delta_{m,n}. \end{aligned}$$

Using above integral the mass-mixing matrix in $A_4^n(x^\mu) - \chi^n(x^\mu)$ basis in R_ξ gauge becomes:

$$M_\xi^n = \begin{pmatrix} m_A^2 + \xi m_{H^n}^2 & (1-\xi) m_A m_{H^n} \\ (1-\xi) m_A m_{H^n} & \xi m_A^2 + m_{H^n}^2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

Let us now pay some attention to the eigenvalues of this matrix M_ξ^n. A straight forward diagonalisation would results into two eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = (m_A^2 + m_{H^n}^2)$ and $\lambda_2 = \xi\ (m_A^2 + m_{H^n}^2)$. It is thus very simple to identify the state with mass(-square) λ_1 with the physical scalar (as this is independent of gauge choice) and the remaining one with the Goldstone. Note that, in the

Feynman gauge (with $\xi = 1$) these two states are mass degenerate. Unitary gauge is equivalent to choosing $\xi \to \infty$, when this second state becomes infinitely heavy and decouples from the theory. And, finally in the Landau gauge, the ξ dependent eigenvalue becomes zero, resulting in vanishing determinant of the mass-matrix and a massless Goldstone mode characteristic of this gauge. However, the mixing angle (θ) is independent of the gauge choice as, $\tan 2\theta = \frac{2m_A m_{Hn}}{m_{Hn}^2 - m_A^2}$. The orthogonal combination to the Goldstone, with eigenvalue $(m_A^2 + m_{H^n}^2)$ is a physical scalar which remains in the theory. Mass of this physical mode is independent of the gauge choice.

In literature [7, 8], taking $A_4 \to 0$ is synonymous with the Unitary gauge. At this points we would like to shed light on this issue in context of our earlier discussion. Extremising the gauge fixed action of A_M (Eq. 1 and Eq. 3) would lead to an equation of motion for $A_\mu(x^\mu, y)$ (under the assumption of $r_G = r_H$):

$$\left[[\Box g^{\mu\nu} + m_A^2 g^{\mu\nu} - (1 - \frac{1}{\xi})\partial^\nu \partial^\mu][1 + r_G\{\delta(y) + \delta(y - \pi R)\}] - \partial_y^2 g^{\mu\nu}\right] A_\mu(x^\mu, y) = 0 \qquad (12)$$

Using $\xi \to \infty$ in the above equation would lead us to the equation of motion for A_μ in the Unitary gauge. However one can also achieve this without gauge-fixing and simply by setting $A_4 \to 0$ in Eq. 1 followed by extermisation of the action. In fact, setting A_4 to zero in Eq. 1 would straightforwardly remove the undesirable terms in which A_μ couples to A_4 via derivative, which was the main purpose of gauge-fixing. However we must keep in mind that the *Goldstone* is a linear combination of A_4 and χ. And the coefficients of this linear combination is independent of choice of gauge. But, as long as we are interested in A_μ and its interactions with other physical particles, taking $A_4 \to 0$ is as good as Unitary gauge. Whenever, one needs to have the interactions involving charged Higgs and/or Goldstones (in some gauge other than the Unitary gauge), one should be more careful and should use the proper definitions of these scalars. A more careful look at the expression for the mixing angle in the Charged Higgs/Goldstone sector would reveal that in the large R^{-1} limit ($R^{-1} >> v$) , Charged Higgs state can be identified with χ while A_4 becomes the Goldstone.

In summary, we have discussed, the gauge-fixing procedure in a model of Universal Extra Dimensions with boundary localised-kinetic terms where a gauge symmetry is spontaneously broken by Higgs mechanism. Finally we have discussed the composition and masses of the Goldstone and physical scalar in this model.

Acknowledgements : AD acknowledges partial financial support from BRNS-DAE, Govt. of India. AS is support by UGC Senior Research Fellowship. Authors are grateful to Amitava Raychaudhuri for carefully reading the manuscript and several illuminating discussions. Authors are also grateful to Tapoja Jha for pointing out a very important point regarding the y-dependent part of solutions of A_4.

References

[1] G. Servant and T. M. P. Tait, Nucl. Phys. B **650** (2003) 391, [arXiv: hep-ph/0206071]; D. Majumdar, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **18** (2003) 1705; K. Kong and K. T. Matchev, JHEP **0601** (2006) 038 [arXiv: hep-ph/0509119]; F. Burnell and G. D. Kribs, Phys. Rev. D **73** (2006) 015001, [arXiv:hep-ph/0509118]; A. Datta, U. K. Dey, A. Raychaudhuri, and A. Shaw, Phys. Rev. D **88** (2013) 016011, [arXiv:1305.4507 [hep-ph]].

[2] K. R. Dienes, E. Dudas and T. Gherghetta, Phys. Lett. B **436** (1998) 55, [arXiv:hep-ph/9803466]; K. Dienes, E. Dudas, and T. Gherghetta, Nucl. Phys. B **537** (1999) 47, [arXiv:hep-ph/9806292]; G. Bhattacharyya, A. Datta, S. K. Majee, A. Raychaudhuri, Nucl.Phys. B **760** (2007) 117, [arXiv:hep-ph/0608208].

[3] T. Appelquist, H. C. Cheng and B. A. Dobrescu, Phys. Rev. D **64** (2001) 035002, [arXiv:hep-ph/0012100].

[4] H. Georgi, A. K. Grant and G. Hailu, Phys. Lett. B **506** (2001) 207, [arXiv:hep-ph/0012379].

[5] H. C. Cheng, K. T. Matchev and M. Schmaltz, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 036005, [arXiv:hep-ph/0204342].

[6] G. R. Dvali, G. Gabadadze, M. Kolanovic and F. Nitti, Phys. Rev. D **64** (2001) 084004, [arXiv:hep-ph/0102216]; F. del Aguila, M. Perez-Victoria and J. Santiago, JHEP **0302** (2003) 051 [hep-th/0302023]; F. del Aguila, M. Perez-Victoria and J. Santiago, Acta Phys. Polon. B **34** (2003) 5511, [hep-ph/0310353]; A. Datta, K. Nishiwaki and S. Niyogi, JHEP **1211** (2012) 154, [arXiv:1206.3987 [hep-ph]]; A. Datta, K. Nishiwaki and S. Niyogi, JHEP **1401** (2014) 104, [arXiv:1310.6994 [hep-ph]]; A. Datta, A. Raychaudhuri, and A. Shaw, Phys. Lett. B **730**, 42 (2014), [arXiv:1310.2021 [hep-ph]]; A. Shaw, [arXiv:1405.3139 [hep-ph]].

[7] M. S. Carena, T. M. P. Tait and C. E. M. Wagner, Acta Phys. Polon. B **33** (2002) 2355 [arXiv:hep-ph/0207056].

[8] A. Datta, U. K. Dey, A. Shaw, and A. Raychaudhuri, Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) 076002 arXiv:1205.4334 [hep-ph].

[9] T. Flacke, A. Menon and D. J. Phalen, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 056009 [arXiv:0811.1598 [hep-ph]].

[10] A. Mück, Ph. D dissertation, University of Würzburg, 2004.